

2831-82
DDS&T 2712-82

15 June 1982

MEMORANDUM FOR: Deputy Director of Central Intelligence

FROM : Leslie C. Dirks
Deputy Director for Science and Technology

SUBJECT : STAP Suggestions

1. Attached are comments keyed to the subject note that you received from the DCI. I fully agree with the recommendations in paragraphs 1, 2, and 3, and believe that we have been working in this direction for some time. However, I am concerned about the criticism in paragraph 4. If there's something we've missed we're grateful for the comments. But I am skeptical that this is the case. Because of CIA's limited R&D budget we are very conscious of taking advantage of what others are doing. Furthermore, because of CIA's unique mission, "small systems" should be, and I believe are, our strength. The STAP people just haven't spent enough time trying to understand what we do to criticize with confidence the state-of-the-art used in CIA clandestine systems. Before expressing their concerns to you and the Director, the STAP should do their homework by having an ad hoc investigative team talk with those involved. As has been suggested, we will gladly identify someone from the S&T to lead the sub-panel members to the right people and help them ferret out the facts.

2. We believe that you and the Director would be better served if the STAP would talk to us and others before giving their counsel. We'll contact [redacted] about his suggestions. If the STAP has found something that we have not, we will be happy to take a close look.

25X1

25X1



Leslie C. Dirks

Attachments:
STAP Suggestions and Comments on same



SECRET

B230

SECRET

Attachment to:
DDS&T 2712-82

COMMENTS ON STAP SUGGESTIONS

1. The facts on the number of vacancies in the DDS&T suggest that we are meeting our goals in recruiting the high quality people we need to do our work. We have long recognized the importance of having our line people, usually mid-level managers at grades 14 and 15, participate directly in recruiting. They do this to satisfy their staffing needs as well as the general needs of CIA. We try to match the "line recruiter" with the school from which he or she graduated, the type of individual being recruited (electrical engineer, photo scientist, etc.) and the specific office(s) having vacancies. We think that this is an effective way to recruit and that we're doing a good job. Our recruiting problem is not who is doing the recruiting but whether we can compete with industry salaries and industry's ability to quickly make firm job offers and commitments on employment starting dates.

2. We've had a two-track system available for certain technical experts for some time. Recently, the "SPS" category was de-emphasized, in general over our objections, but not in fact eliminated. This has caused some problems. We have recently asked the Director of Personnel to help us expand (by 20, GS-15 and 12 SIS-1/2 positions) the number of non-managerial senior positions and he has, we believe, agreed to do this. This will make approximately 10 percent of our GS-15 and SIS positions non-managerial in nature. If experience shows this to be too few to retain our talent, we'll increase the percentage.

With regard to clearances for new technical recruits, we're sympathetic to the DCI's objective. We are pleased with the recent progress that Personnel and Security have made, recognizing that we can still speed things up. However, a few months will always stand between our first contact with a recruit and his or her final approval. From the time a recruit completes the PHS we have been seeing a 4 to 5 month span until a full clearance is issued.

3. I am told that all applicants who are asked to come to Washington for an interview are given a GTR for round-trip airfare, \$75 per diem, plus airfare and per diem for a return when polygraphs and medicals are given. Nevertheless, we probably look bad when compared to industry. For a small investment this could be corrected. First impressions are lasting and we are often penny wise and dollar foolish.

Applicants within a 50 mile radius of Washington are not reimbursed for their travel by the Office of Personnel. Individual components can bear this cost if they wish. Here again for a small investment we can improve the chance of making a good first impression.

SECRET

4. We believe that the STAP has somewhat misled the Director to believe that ORD and OTS are "well behind the curve in exploiting state-of-the-art technology to develop small systems." CIA's

Because the Director's paragraph 4 is stated generally, we cannot be sure what the STAP has seen at NSA. We are confident, however, that we are not "behind". One of ORD's principal responsibilities is to keep tuned into the R&D efforts of others. For example, ORD hosted a presentation by R Group of NSA about five weeks ago which was attended by individuals from four S&T offices. The briefing represented a tour de force of that Group's efforts. There were no "technology" surprises. As expected there were some areas of research and development at NSA that are not being considered for application at CIA. These reflect the differences between CIA's and NSA's way of doing business. However, there were far more examples of commonality in interest and pursuit

Page Denied

Executive Registry

82-1442/1

1 June 1982

MEMORANDUM FOR: Executive Director
FROM: Director of Central Intelligence
SUBJECT: STAP Suggestions

1. My discussions with STAP this morning brought forth some suggestions about improving the recruitment of scientific and technical personnel. Their study shows that NSA has the largest and most difficult requirements and they believe that NSA is making significant progress by having middle-level managers go out and do interviews at colleges and elsewhere. This is an approach which commends itself to me for analytical personnel and career trainees as well.

2. They recommended a two-track system, a technical track and an executive track, something which more and more corporations are developing and which we have made a modest beginning at with respect to analysts. It seems to me we should be able to reduce the 10-12 months required to get clearances for new technical recruits.

3. Another impediment cited was failure to reimburse travel expenses for candidates coming in for recruitment interviews. I don't know what the pros and cons of that policy may be, but it seems like a small issue to stand in the way of more successful recruitment.

4. A significant criticism is that the Research and Development and Technical Service elements of the Science and Technology Directorate are well behind the curve in exploiting state-of-the-art technology to develop small systems. NSA, they say, is using state-of-the-art technology with which CIA components have not yet worked. If that is true there is something wrong, and we should have Ev Hineman look into it very thoroughly.

C
William J. Casey

25X1

SECRET